

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/089,165	06/24/2002	Seizo Sunago	221181US3PCT	9703	
22850	7590 08/21/2006		EXAMINER		
C. IRVIN MCCLELLAND			DEAK, LESLIE R		
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			3761		
			DATE MAILED: 08/21/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/089,165	SUNAGO ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Leslie R. Deak	3761	

	Leslie R. Deak	3761			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the d	orrespondence add	ress		
THE REPLY FILED <u>07 August 2006</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.			
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	ving replies: (1) an amendment, aft tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in (idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire is Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (2) the Note of The Statut PE	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THI	g date of the final rejecti	on.		
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70 Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date		I36(a) and the appropria	te extension fee		
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropr inally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as		
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of se appeal. Since		
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>					
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,			ecause		
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co		TE below);			
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo		duaina ar aimhlifeina	the issues for		
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bei	tter form for appear by materially re	ducing or simplifying	the issues for		
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally re	ected claims.			
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).		
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)			(
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	llowable if submitted in a separate,				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		ill be entered and an e	explanation of		
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-19</u> .					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE					
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	it before or on the date of filing a N d sufficient reasons why the affida	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> vit or other evidence i	ot be entered s necessary and		
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome all rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a		
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	entry is below or attac	hed.		
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet.	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:		
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper I	Vo(s)			
13. Other:					
TATYANA ZALUKAEVA					
Thu Aurola	PRIMARY EXAMINE				

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 7-05)

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Part of Paper No. 20060816

St 16 Augolo

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Applicant alleges that the amendment to claim 1 merely incorporates the limitations of cancelled claims 2-4 and 6. However, applicant includes in the last 3 lines of amended claim 1 functional limitations that were not reviously presented for examination. Such limitations, while present in the specification, were not read into the claims during examination. As such, the new limitations require further search and consideration.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments with regard to the patentability of the claims over the prior art of record are based on the presently-amended claims, which have not been entered.

With regard to applicant's arguments drawn to the double-patenting rejection, applicant argues that the Sunago reference shows a chamber 309 located outside chamber 301, which does not anticipate the instant invention. However, the instant claims do not set forth theat the secondary chamber be located inside the primary chamber. Applicant uses the language "holds" which does not exclude the possibility that the two chambers are connected outside of one another. With regard to the mixing operation of claim 1, the limitation is newly-presented, and has not been entered.